

COOLEY LLP
BOBBY GHAJAR (198719)
(bghajar@cooley.com)
COLETTE GHAZARIAN (322235)
(cghazarian@cooley.com)
1333 2nd Street, Suite 400
Santa Monica, California 90401
Telephone: (310) 883-6400
Facsimile: (310) 883-6500

ANGELA L. DUNNING (212047)
(adunning@cooley.com)
MARK WEINSTEIN (193043)
(mweinstein@cooley.com)
JUDD LAUTER (290945)
(jlauter@cooley.com)
3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000
Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

LEX LUMINA PLLC
MARK A. LEMLEY (155830)
(mlemley@lex-lumina.com)
745 Fifth Avenue, Suite 500
New York, NY 10151
Telephone: (646) 898-2055
Facsimile: (646) 906-8657

Counsel for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RICHARD KADREY, an individual; SARAH
SILVERMAN, an individual; CHRISTOPHER
GOLDEN, an individual,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware
corporation;

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER TO
ENLARGE BRIEFING ON DEFENDANT'S
MOTION TO DISMISS**

Trial Date: None
Date Action Filed: July 7, 2023

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11 and Paragraph 35 of the Court’s Standing Order, Plaintiffs Richard Kadrey, Sarah Silverman, and Christopher Golden (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) and defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Meta” or “Defendant”) submit this Stipulation (“Stipulation”) to enlarge the page limits for the Parties’ briefs in connection with Defendant’s forthcoming Motion to Dismiss the Complaint (“Motion to Dismiss”). Good cause exists to grant this Stipulation, as discussed below.

1. Plaintiffs filed the Complaint (Dkt. 1) in this action on July 7, 2023. The Complaint asserts six claims for (1) Direct Copyright Infringement (17 U.S.C. § 106), (2) Vicarious Copyright Infringement (17 U.S.C. § 106), (3) Removal of Copyright-Management Information and False Assertion of Copyright (17 U.S.C. §§ 1202(a), 1202(b)), (4) Unfair Competition (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*), (5) Unjust Enrichment (California common law), and (6) Negligence (California common law).

2. Meta intends to file a motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) directed to all six claims in the Complaint.

3. Paragraph 35 of the Court’s Standing Order provides that, “[u]nless expressly permitted by the Court, briefs in support of and in opposition to all substantive motions . . . may not exceed 15 pages, and reply briefs may not exceed 10 pages.”

4. Meta seeks a modest enlargement of the page limits from 15 to 20 pages for Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss and Plaintiffs’ Opposition respectively (5 extra pages), and from 10 to 12.5 pages for Defendant’s Reply (2.5 extra pages).

5. Meta believes that good cause exists for this request. Meta’s Motion to Dismiss will address each of Plaintiffs’ six claims. The arguments directed to each claim will involve discussion of distinct allegations and authorities, and Meta will undertake every effort to streamline them. However, Meta believes its ability to provide the Court with the arguments and authority necessary to appropriately resolve the Motion will be compromised by the default page limit.

6. The Parties have met and conferred, and Plaintiffs do not object to Meta’s request for the enlargement of page limits.

[~~PROPOSED~~] ORDER

PURSUANT TO THE STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED:

1. The page limit for Defendant's forthcoming Motion to Dismiss and any Opposition by Plaintiffs is 20 pages; and
2. The page limit for the Reply in support of Defendant's Motion is 12.5 pages.

Dated: September 14, 2023



HON. VINCE CHHABRIA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE